(2) Suits for partition should be made cognisable by a special officer appointed for the purpose who should be empowered to effect partition in person.

(3) The above suggestions might necessitate the enactment of a special Regulation or some amendment or change in the existing law which should be made by the Government in view of the immense benefit which would accrue to the people.

(4) The Government should in future refuse to recognise *oodukoor* in the revenue and other Government records.

Since the subject was both important and complicated, he requested that the Government might appoint a committee of officials and non-officials to enquire into the matter and make the necessary suggestions for abolishing the system.

Dewan's reply.—The suggestion of the Member is vague and indefinite, and, I fear, impracticable also. The representation will, however, be referred to the Land Revenue Commissioner for remarks and the matter will be considered on receipt of his report.

10. Desirability of not commencing resettlement without resurvey.

Mr. A. Mahomed Khan (Member, Kunnattur Taluk) spoke on the desirability of commencing resettlement operations in the taluks which had become ripe for such resettlement, only after the completion of a preliminary resurvey. He pointed out that the original scheme of land records work had undergone modifications and had become so much attenuated in practice that, instead of the anomaly and confusion of the last survey and settlement being a thing of the past, the present arrangement only served to worsen the prevailing confusion. The hardships and inconveniences to which the land-owning classes had become subject consequent on the deflection of the Survey and Settlement Departments from their original programme had, with lapse of time and subsequent neglect, now become almost intolerable. The indifferent original survey had only been further spoiled by the untrained settlement agency, and the scope of land records work intended to set right those defects had now been whittled down to such an extent that it did not touch even the fringe of survey. He stated that the last survey and settlement had completely failed of their object and that the half-hearted attempts subsequently made had only further complicated the existing confusion. The village maps and the incomplete subdivision sketches were partially unsatisfactory and partially unreliable and the conditions that prevailed in the period anterior to the last survey and settlement were in operation even to-day though in a slightly modified form. To illustrate the above he stated that the village maps and subdivision sketches prepared were of very little use, that discrepancies between actual and recorded areas formed the rule, instead of being the exception, that the issue of *pattas* for *puduval*, *pokkuvaravu*, etc., had been almost completely ignored, that the tax-receipt books did not show the survey numbers to which the tax related, that the *pakuthies* were almost wholly manned by irresponsible and ill-educated striplings, that there were no sketches of any kind whatever for most of the subdivisions entered in the *tandaper*, and that the *puduval* sketches made by the Revenue Department were worse than the subdivision sketches of the Settlement Department. Lastly, he requested the Government to openly declare that they would not go back upon the policy laid down in their order on the Final Settlement Report of the State in the matter of resettlement and that they would not launch a settlement scheme behind the back of the people without carrying out a careful and accurate resurvey.

Dewan's reply.—I have listened to the Member very attentively. While a good deal of what the Member says in regard to the condition of land records in the State is quite correct, I am afraid that he has not made out a case for a resurvey. He has not clearly perceived the difference between a resurvey and the conduct and completion of land records operations. A resurvey becomes necessary only when the frame-work of the survey has become faulty. He has not said how the present frame-work is faulty. He says that survey fields do not represent holdings. In no country that I know of is it so. In Madras, where the *ryotwari* system is most

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

prevalent, each revenue field does not represent a revenue holding. It is the subdivision that represents it and the demarcation of subdivisions has been given up there as a too costly and unnecessary process. We, of course, want correct maps of the subdivisions. It is that that we are trying to effect. It is only filling in details in the existing survey that we really need and it can be done in the course of the present land records maintenance work, which is cheaper than resurvey. I have looked into the question carefully, and I think that, so far at least as the taluks surveyed under the *tak* system are concerned, a resurvey is quite unnecessary and would be a waste of money. I am not, however, prepared to say whether, in regard to taluks not surveyed under the *tak* system, a resurvey would be necessary or not. I have examined the framework of the existing survey in a number of taluks such as Tiruvalla, Chirayinkil and Quilon, and I have found that there is nothing to show that the frame work of the survey was faulty. In these circumstances, I do not see why you want a resurvey which is much more costly than a supplemental survey. What you really want is an agreement of the state of affairs on the ground with that in the village records. The arrears of that work have accumulated owing to lack of proper supervision, and the neglect of that work by the village staff, the land records maintenance staff and the taluk staff. We are trying to rectify these defects and bring these records up to date.

11. The need for certain additional provisions in the Puduval Rules, dated the 31st March, 1921.

Mr. J. Padmanabha Kammatti (Member, Muvattupuzha Taluk) represented that Part IV of the Revised Puduval Rules relating to the disposal of occupied lands was defective and required modification. He said that occupied lands should be classified under two heads, *viz.*, (1) excess area found within registered holdings, and (2) Government lands occupied without permission by people with a view to get them registered in their names, and stated that those two classes of lands deserved not indentical, but distinct treatment. The Member observed that no differentiation had been made in the Revised Puduval Rules in regard to the disposal of those two kinds of lands, and that, under those Rules, they were to be assigned to the occupants on payment of *tharavila* equivalent to the market value of similar lands in the neighbourhood. The levy of market value on occupied *puduval* lands was very hard and it was much more so in the case of excess areas within registered holdings. It was owing to the arbitrary action of Government servants that excess lands were to be seen in registered holdings; and he urged that only the same *tharavila* as was realised for the original registry should be imposed in respect of excess areas.

The Member stated that the prices offered by and realised from parties for Government lands varied according to their wealth and influence and did not represent the real value of the lands concerned, and that, as such, to take such prices as the standard for fixing *tharavila* for occupied lands was unjustifiable. Even the levy of market rates was not being enforced in accordance with any principle, it being left to the will and fancy of the Tahsildar. The Member then spoke about the irregularities of precedure on the part of Tahsildars in that matter and pointed out that such irregularities led to considerable hardship to the landholders concerned. The Member cited the case of Muvattupuzha as an instance and said that more than 2,474 acres of occupied lands in that taluk had to be vacated by the occupants on account of the very heavy *tharavila* fixed for them, and that, subsequently, when those lands were put up to auction with an upset price considerably lower than that originally demanded from the occupants, no one came forward to bid. That showed how indiscriminately the Tahsildars fixed *tharavila* on *puduval* lands.

The Member next referred to the high rates of assessment imposed on *puduval* lands. He said that, while, before the settlement, dry lands were being assessed at the 13th *tharam*, the rate generally imposed at present was the 6th, although the lands now available for assignment were inferior in quality to those assigned in the past.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly